

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 16, 2007 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 28 have been amended. Claims 31-37 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Claims 18, 21, 24, 25, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-6

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mark (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0060746) in view of Beaudry (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0267180). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a first marking external to the first cavity identifying a location of the first cavity.” These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. According to the Office Action at page 3, Mark discloses a conduit 39 that indicates the location of a first cavity. However, even assuming *arguendo* that the Office’s characterization of Mark is correct, Mark does not disclose a **marking** that identifies the location of the first cavity. Further, Beaudry does not remedy the deficiency of Mark. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, claims 2-6 recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 1-6 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 19, 20 and 22-31

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 19, 20 and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane (U.S. Patent No. 6,811,341) in view of Beaudry. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite “identifying a substance based on a marking of the support member.” Neither of the cited references discloses or suggests a marking that identifies a substance. Accordingly, the cited references necessarily fail to disclose or suggest identifying a substance based on a marking, as recited in claim 7.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 9 and 10, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 7. In addition, claims 9 and 10 recite additional novel elements.

With respect to claim 13, the claim recites “a first marking external to the cavity, the first marking identifying the monomer.” As explained above, none of the cited references disclose or suggests a marking of any kind, including a marking identifying a monomer. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 13.

Claims 14-16 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 14-16, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 13. In addition, claims 14-16 recite additional novel elements.

With respect to claim 19, the claim recites “providing a first marking external to the first cavity, the first marking identifying the first substance.” As explained above, none of the cited references disclose or suggests a marking of any kind, including a marking identifying a first substance. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19.

Claims 20, 22, 23, 26 and 27 depend from claim 19. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 20, 22, 23, 26 and 27, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 19. In addition, claims 20, 22, 23, 26 and 27 recite

additional novel elements. Claims 24 and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

With respect to claim 28, the claim recites “a first marking external to the first cavity, the first marking identifying the first substance.” As explained above, none of the cited references disclose or suggests a marking of any kind, including a marking identifying a first substance. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 28.

Claims 30 and 31 depend from claim 28. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 30 and 31, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 28. In addition, claims 30 and 31 recite additional novel elements. Claim 29 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 19, 20 and 22-31 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, 17, 21 and 32

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 8, 11, 12, 17, 21 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Beaudry, and further in view of D’Alessio et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,940). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 8, 11, and 12 depend from claim 7. Claim 17 depends from claim 13. Claim 32 depends from claim 28. As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 7, 13, and 28. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 8, 11, 12, 17, and 32, at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on claims 1, 7, 13, and 28. In addition, claims 8, 11, 12, 17, and 32 recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 8, 11, 12, 17, 21 and 32 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 18

At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Beaudry, and further in view of Mark. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 18 is respectfully requested.

New Claims 33-37

Claims 33-37 have been added. Each of these claims recites features not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Consideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)

September 17, 2007

Date